

Berndt/Aldrich US Nuclear Host Communities Replication Dataset Codebook

This replication dataset is based on Replication Data for: Power to the People or Regulatory Ratcheting? Explaining the Success (or Failure) of Attempts to Site Commercial U.S. Nuclear Power Plants: 1954-1996/ U.S. Nuclear Host Communities Dataset: Version 10 (Built: 20 Nov 2015 10:40). Unless otherwise noted, year-level data were sampled from the year prior to the siting outcome and decade-level data were sampled from the decade nearest the siting outcome.

Note: The summary values displayed below are *not* weighted. To replicate the summary statistics and model results, analyses should utilize the frequency weight variable "UnitsCase". As the rows in the dataset record distinct siting outcomes (in terms of the completion and cancellation years and the siting outcome), weights were used to account for cases involving multiple reactors that experienced the same siting outcomes at the same site in the same years, and represented *more* than a single outcome in the analysis. See variable UnitsCase for details.

NPPname: Nuclear Power Project Name

unique values: 186	missing "": 0/186
--------------------	-------------------

examples: "Allens Creek 1"
"St. Rosalie 1, 2"
"Jamesport 2"
"Shoreham"

Notes:

Source: Data primarily generated from printed records in the reports "U.S. Central Station Nuclear Electric Generating Units: Significant Milestones" (1981), "Nuclear Power Generation and Fuel Cycle Report 1997" (Appendix C) (1997), and from volumes of Heddleson's series of publications "Design Data and Safety Features of Commercial Nuclear Power Plants" (1973–1976), along with other sources.

Details: Variable lists the name commonly used to refer to each project in AEC/NRC documents, or other archival sources.

Link: Digital copy of original printed resource ("Significant Milestones..." report) available at: <http://www.osti.gov/scitech/servlets/purl/6480768/>

Link: Digital copy of original printed resource ("Fuel Cycle..." report Appendix C) available at: http://webapp1.dlib.indiana.edu/virtual_disk_library/index.cgi/4265704/FID1578/pdf/coal_nuc/043697.pdf

Link: Digital copies of original printed resources ("Design Data..." reports) can be found through the Department of Energy's OSTI Service (example link to Volume V): <http://www.osti.gov/scitech/biblio/7274548-design-data-safety-features-commerical-nuclear-power-plant/>

CountyName: Name of Host Community (County, State Postal Abbreviation)

unique values: 111	missing "": 0/186
--------------------	-------------------

examples: "Sampson, NC"
"Lancaster, PA"
"Ogle, IL"
"Somervell, TX"

Notes:

Berndt/Aldrich US Nuclear Host Communities Replication Dataset Codebook

Source: Each reactor’s host community was determined through the use of a variety of archival sources: The addresses listed in the Nuclear Regulatory Commission’s *Information Digest* reports (many years) provided the information necessary to identify the host counties of some completed projects as well as some cancelled units. The locations of other reactors were determined by examining the site information and drawings in the volumes of the “*Design Data and Safety Features of Commercial Nuclear Power Plants*” reports by Heddleson (1973–1976), as well as by using the latitude-longitude coordinates provided in the report “*Population Distribution Analyses for Nuclear Power Plant Siting*” (1983). The intended sites for a handful of cancelled projects (including the two-unit St. Rosalie project¹ and the three-unit South River project²) proved difficult to locate using the primary reports listed above, and had to be confirmed using a range of additional archival sources, including reports from other government agencies, newspaper stories from local or regional newspaper archives, etc. (see examples provided in footnotes).

Details: Variable lists the host community’s county name and two-letter postal abbreviation (for the state) for each nuclear project.

Link: Digital copies of NRC’s annual *Information Digest* reports for various years can be found through the Department of Energy’s OSTI Service, while the most up-to-date report can be found at: <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/doc-collections/nuregs/staff/sr1350/>

Link: Digital copy of original printed resource (“*Population Distribution...*” report) can be found at: <http://web.ornl.gov/info/reports/1983/3445600490190.pdf>

Link: Digital copies of original printed resources (“*Design Data...*” reports) can be found through the Department of Energy’s OSTI Service (example link to Volume V): <http://www.osti.gov/scitech/biblio/7274548-design-data-safety-features-commerical-nuclear-power-plant/>

Outcome: Siting Outcome (1 = Success)

range:	[0,1]	units:	1
unique values:	2	missing .:	0/186
tabulation:	Freq.	Value	
	83	0	
	103	1	

Notes:

Source: Data primarily generated from printed records in the reports “*U.S. Central Station Nuclear Electric Generating Units: Significant Milestones*” (1981), “*Nuclear Power Generation and Fuel Cycle Report 1997*” (Appendix C) (1997), and other sources.

Details: Codes plants which were completed and *began commercial operation* as successful (1), and plants which were *cancelled at any other stage* as failed (0).

Link: Digital copy of original printed resource (“*Significant Milestones...*” report) available at: <http://www.osti.gov/scitech/servlets/purl/6480768/>

¹ This report from the U.S. Bureau of Mines was one of the sources used to corroborate the approximate location of the two-unit St. Rosalie project: “...the St. Rosalie Station, will be sited on the west bank of the Mississippi River between the towns of Alliance and Myrtle Grove in *Plaquemines Parish...*” (emphasis added to county name; Sondermayer 1974, 1271).

² This article from the *Fayetteville Observer* was one of the sources used to corroborate the approximate location of the three-unit South River project: “...Carolina Power & Light, which is now Progress Energy, wanted to build a \$1billion nuclear power plant on the South River between Garland and Kerr in *Sampson County...*” (emphasis added to county name; Landis 2003).

Berndt/Aldrich US Nuclear Host Communities Replication Dataset Codebook

Link: Digital copy of original printed resource (“*Fuel Cycle...*” report Appendix C) available at: http://webapp1.dlib.indiana.edu/virtual_disk_library/index.cgi/4265704/FID1578/pdf/coal_nuc/043697.pdf

UnitsCase: Number of Nuclear Reactors in Case (used as frequency weight)

range:	[1,4]	units:	1
unique values:	4	missing .:	0/186
tabulation:	Freq.	Value	
	148	1	
	35	2	
	2	3	
	1	4	

Notes:

Source: N/A

Details: Provides the frequency weight necessary to duplicate certain rows in the dataset, based on the number of cases contained in the row. For instance, in the case of a two-unit project where both units were proposed in the same year and cancelled in the same year, this case would only takes a single row in the dataset, as each unit would have identical values on the time-related variables influencing each outcome. This case is thus expanded in the statistical analysis to account for the fact that more than one reactor reached a siting outcome with those values. If using *STATA*, this expansion can be performed by adding [fw=UnitsCase] to commands when performing analyses (as in the replication .do file). In *R*, one can create a frequency weighted version of the dataset after importing the original dataset as a data.frame: `weighted_dataframe <- dataframe[rep(1:nrow(dataframe), dataframe),]`.

Link: N/A

ProposedYr: Year Nuclear Power Project Proposed (Publicly Announced)

range:	[1955,1978]	units:	1		
unique values:	18	missing .:	0/186		
mean:	1969.84				
std. dev:	3.70183				
percentiles:	10%	25%	50%	75%	90%
	1966	1967	1971	1973	1974

Notes:

Source: Data primarily generated from printed records in the reports “U.S. Central Station Nuclear Electric Generating Units: Significant Milestones” (1981), “Nuclear Power Generation and Fuel Cycle Report 1997” (Appendix C) (1997), and other sources.

Details: Uses the year that each project was *announced* (for most completed projects and cancelled projects) or the year of the project *order’s announcement* (for some cancelled plants).

Link: Digital copy of original printed resource (“Significant Milestones...” report) available at: <http://www.osti.gov/scitech/servlets/purl/6480768/>

Link: Digital copy of original printed resource (“Fuel Cycle...” report Appendix C) available at: http://webapp1.dlib.indiana.edu/virtual_disk_library/index.cgi/4265704/FID1578/pdf/coal_nuc/043697.pdf

CompCancYr: Year of Siting Outcome (Completion or Cancellation)

range:	[1959,1996]	units:	1		
unique values:	26	missing .:	0/186		
mean:	1979.32				
std. dev:	6.06464				
percentiles:	10%	25%	50%	75%	90%
	1973	1974	1980	1984	1987

Notes:

Source: Data primarily generated from printed records in "U.S. Central Station Nuclear Electric Generating Units: Significant Milestones" (1981) and "Nuclear Power Generation and Fuel Cycle Report 1997 (Appendix C)" (1997), and other sources.

Details: Uses the *year of first commercial operation* for completed plants, and *year of cancellation* (as determined by the AEC/NRC records) for cancelled cases.

Link: Digital copy of original printed resource ("Significant Milestones..." report) available at: <http://www.osti.gov/scitech/servlets/purl/6480768/>

Link: Digital copy of original printed resource ("Fuel Cycle..." report Appendix C) available at: http://webapp1.dlib.indiana.edu/virtual_disk_library/index.cgi/4265704/FID1578/pdf/coal_nuc/043697.pdf

GuideRevisions: Number of Revisions to Regulatory Guides over the Duration of the Siting Attempt

range:	[0,258]	units:	1		
unique values:	46	missing .:	0/186		
mean:	117.565				
std. dev:	85.2791				
percentiles:	10%	25%	50%	75%	90%
	5	14	145	194	212

Notes:

Source: Data for each regulatory guide collected from records on the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's website; variable only counts revisions to regulatory guides which were coded as affecting commercial nuclear power projects in the *Energy Economic Data Base* (1984).

Details: Codes the number of revisions to issued regulatory guides that occurred over the duration of each case, or between the year of public announcement (ProposedYr) to year prior to the project's completion or cancellation (CompCancYr - 1).³

Link: Data sources (Dates for each revision to issued regulatory guides): <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/doc-collections/reg-guides/>

Link: Data sources (*Energy Economic Data Base* report; relevant regulatory guides listed in Appendix A): <http://www.osti.gov/scitech/biblio/6504693>

³ In keeping with the coding of other variables, the year *prior* to the siting outcome (CompCancYr - 1) is used as the end point for the series: As only the outcome *year* was known for certain cases, we could not determine whether the cases reached its siting outcome at the start or end of the year, and thus could not determine which revisions occurring in the outcome year should be considered to have impacted the project prior to its conclusion in that year. Thus, the measure is slightly conservative.

ElecDemandGrowth: (Five-Year) State-Level Demand Growth for Electricity

range:	[-.02855493, .08618529]				units:	1.000e-11
unique values:	150				missing .:	5/186
mean:	.036191					
std. dev:	.022103					
percentiles:	10%	25%	50%	75%	90%	
	.011568	.019576	.036488	.052357	.062995	

Notes:

Source: Data from U.S. Energy Information Administration’s data series titled: “State Energy Data System 1960-2013”.

Details: Uses state-level data from variable "ESTXP" which is defined as "*Electricity total end-use consumption (i.e., sold)*". This raw data was converted into a five-year straight-line growth rate using the equation: $(\frac{value_n - value_{n-5}}{value_{n-5}})$, where *value* is the value from the ESTXP data and *n* is the year prior to the siting outcome for each case.

Link: Raw data available at: http://www.eia.gov/state/seds/sep_use/total/csv/use_all_phy.zip

CoalTotalCost: Total Cost (Nominal cents per kWh generated) in year prior to the Siting Outcome

range:	[.53525977, 3.9853773]				units:	1.000e-08
unique values:	20				missing .:	11/186
mean:	2.28748					
std. dev:	1.03134					
percentiles:	10%	25%	50%	75%	90%	
	.917	1.15471	2.32116	3.37903	3.61911	

Notes:

Source: Data from McNerney et al.'s (2011) replication datasets.

Details: Variable relies on data from column "R" of the file "MainCosts.xls" from the authors’ replication datasets, labeled “Total Cost, Nominal cents per kWh generated”, and uses the value from the year prior to the case’s siting outcome.

Link: Raw data available at: http://www.santafe.edu/files/coal_electricity_data

SenContSite: Control of State Senate prior to Siting Outcome (1 = Democrat; 0 = Republican)

range:	[0,1]			units:	1
unique values:	2			missing .:	3/186
tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label		
	52	0	Republican Control		
	131	1	Democratic Control		
	3	.			

Notes:

Source: Data generated from Klarner's (2003) State-Level Partisan Composition dataset.

Berndt/Aldrich US Nuclear Host Communities Replication Dataset Codebook

Details: Data generated from variable "sen_cont_alt2" by dropping cases of independent control (from "0" to "." or "missing"). The replication dataset variable now reports 1 = "Democratic Control" and 0 = "Republican Control" in the year prior to the siting outcome.

Link: Raw data available

at: <https://dataverse.harvard.edu/dataset.xhtml?persistentId=hdl:1902.1/20403>

HousContSite: Control of State House prior to Siting Outcome (1 = Democrat; 0 = Republican)

range:	[0,1]	units:	1
unique values:	2	missing .:	5/186
tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	40	0	Republican Control
	141	1	Democratic Control
	5	.	

Notes:

Source: Data generated from Klarner's (2003) State-Level Partisan Composition dataset.

Details: Data generated from variable "hs_cont_alt2" by dropping cases of independent control (from "0" to "." or "missing"). The replication dataset variable now reports 1 = "Democratic Control" and 0 = "Republican Control" in the year prior to the siting outcome.

Link: Raw data available

at: <https://dataverse.harvard.edu/dataset.xhtml?persistentId=hdl:1902.1/20403>

GovPartySite: Governor's Party prior to Siting Outcome (1 = Democrat; 0 = Republican)

range:	[0,1]	units:	1
unique values:	2	missing .:	1/186
tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	84	0	Republican
	101	1	Democrat
	1	.	

Notes:

Source: Data generated from Klarner's (2003) State-Level Partisan Composition dataset.

Details: Data generated from variable "govparty_c2" by dropping cases where governors are members of Independent or Third-Parties (from "0" to "." or "missing"). The replication dataset variable now reports 1 = "Democratic Governor" and 0 = "Republican Governor" in the year prior to the siting outcome.

Link: Raw data available

at: <https://dataverse.harvard.edu/dataset.xhtml?persistentId=hdl:1902.1/20403>

VoterTurnout: Voter Turnout (Voting Age Population; %)

range:	[32.19833,80.28169]	units:	.00001		
unique values:	154	missing .:	0/186		
mean:	57.222				
std. dev:	9.79471				
percentiles:	10%	25%	50%	75%	90%
	45.8605	51.3209	57.9046	64.1381	70.3046

Notes:

Source: Data from Gomez et al.'s (2007) replication dataset.

Details: Uses data from column "Turnout" from their replication dataset. The data in the replication dataset reports the turnout rate in each county in the Presidential election closest—but prior to—the siting outcome. As Gomez et al.'s data accounted for number of citizens that turned out to vote against the total population in each county that were of voting *age*, it could not exclude citizens who are of voting age but would be legally ineligible to vote from the statistic.

Link: Data available at: http://myweb.fsu.edu/bgomez/Weather_Public_File.zip

StandardizedDemVote: (Standardized) Proportion of County-Level Vote for Democratic Presidential Candidate

range:	[-.3322269,.55132824]	units:	1.000e-10		
unique values:	142	missing .:	13/186		
mean:	-.025314				
std. dev:	.123586				
percentiles:	10%	25%	50%	75%	90%
	-.16463	-.101876	-.034265	.030248	.134903

Notes:

Source: Raw county-level vote proportion data provided by ICPSR study 13 (1950-1990), as well as records from the U.S. Census Bureau for later years.

Details: Data generated by subtracting each county's proportion of votes for the Democratic Presidential candidate in the closest Presidential election prior to the siting outcome from the county's rolling mean of the proportion of votes for the Democratic Presidential candidates for the three elections *prior to* (i.e., excluding) the closest election. This standardization was intended to remove short-term changes in the level of support for the Democratic Party that can be more directly attributed to the popularity of certain candidates or other short-term, election-specific effects.

Link: Raw data available in ICPSR 13 (1950-1990): <https://www.icpsr.umich.edu/icpsrweb/RCMD/studies/13>

Link: Raw data available in ELE01.xls (later years): <http://www2.census.gov/prod2/statcomp/usac/excel/ELE01.xls>

MWe_100: Nuclear Unit(s) Power Output (MWe / 100)

range:	[.65,13.04]	units:	.01		
unique values:	95	missing .:	0/186		
mean:	10.0461				
std. dev:	2.35349				
percentiles:	10%	25%	50%	75%	90%
	6.93	8.7	10.79	11.5	12.5

Notes:

Source: Data primarily generated from printed records in the reports “U.S. Central Station Nuclear Electric Generating Units: Significant Milestones” (1981), “Nuclear Power Generation and Fuel Cycle Report 1997” (Appendix C) (1997), and Heddleson’s publications on the design features of nuclear power plants, including the volumes of “Design Data and Safety Features of Commercial Nuclear Power Plants” (1973–1976) and the report “Summary Data for U. S. Commercial Nuclear Power Plants in the United States” (1978).

Details: Reports the projected power output of each individual nuclear reactor unit (e.g., each unit in multi-unit cases) divided by 100 to scale the unstandardized coefficient’s value.

Link: Digital copy of original printed resource (“Significant Milestones...” report) available at: <http://www.osti.gov/scitech/servlets/purl/6480768/>

Link: Digital copy of original printed resource (“Fuel Cycle...” report Appendix C) available at: http://webapp1.dlib.indiana.edu/virtual_disk_library/index.cgi/4265704/FID1578/pdf/coal_nuc/043697.pdf

Link: Digital copies of original printed resources (“Design Data...” or “Summary Data...” reports) can be found through the Department of Energy’s OSTI Service (example link to Volume V of the “Design Data...” series): <http://www.osti.gov/scitech/biblio/7274548-design-data-safety-features-commerical-nuclear-power-plant/>

CompletedUnits: Units Completed on Same Site before year of Siting Outcome

range:	[0,2]	units:	1
unique values:	3	missing .:	0/186
tabulation:	Freq.	Value	
	148	0	
	37	1	
	1	2	

Notes:

Source: Data generated from information provided by CompCancYRS, Outcome, and NPPname.

Details: Variable reports the number of nuclear reactor units previously *completed* (cancelled units are not counted towards this total) within the same host community prior to the current project’s siting outcome year. Multi-unit projects in which all units reached a successful outcome in the same year have values of 0, as it was difficult to determine the order of each unit’s outcomes.

Link: N/A

log_PopTOT1k: (log) County Population (1000s)

range:	[.72124857,8.8517923]	units:	1.000e-08		
unique values:	131	missing .:	0/186		
mean:	4.43143				
std. dev:	1.51304				
percentiles:	10%	25%	50%	75%	90%
	2.67442	3.4518	4.20756	5.48899	6.5466

Notes:

Source: County-level population variables included in the digital editions of the U.S. Census Bureau's series of *County and City Data Books* for 1956-1977 (ICPSR 7736), 1983 (ICPSR 8256), and 1994 (University of Virginia).

Details: Data rescaled (*County Population / 1000*) and then log-transformed to account for non-normality in the distribution of values. Each case was associated with data from a volume of the *County and City Data Books* from the same decade as the case's siting outcome.

Link: Raw data available in ICPSR 7736 - County and City Data Book 1947-1977: <https://www.icpsr.umich.edu/icpsrweb/ICPSR/studies/7736/version/2>

Link: Raw data available in ICPSR 8256 - County and City Data Book 1983 (DS1): <https://www.icpsr.umich.edu/icpsrweb/RCMD/studies/8256>

Link: Raw data available in University of Virginia - County and City Data Book (1994): http://ccdb.lib.virginia.edu/ccdb/ccdb/choose_states?type=county&year=1994

FarmAreaProp: County Land Area in Farms (proportion of all land)

range:	[.028,.98]	units:	1.000e-08		
unique values:	124	missing .:	0/186		
mean:	.427519				
std. dev:	.269319				
percentiles:	10%	25%	50%	75%	90%
	.1	.196	.347	.657	.879

Notes:

Source: Data collected from variables included in the digital editions of the U.S. Census Bureau's series of *County and City Data Books* for 1956-1977 (ICPSR 7736), 1983 (ICPSR 8256), and 1994 (University of Virginia).

Details: Data on the proportion of each county's land area in farms provided in the *County and City Data Books* for 1956-1983, or generated from other variables (county total farm area and county total land area) for the *County and City Data Books* for 1988 and 1994. Each case was associated with data from a volume of the *County and City Data Books* from the same decade as the case's siting outcome.

Link: Raw data available in ICPSR 7736 - County and City Data Book 1947-1977: <https://www.icpsr.umich.edu/icpsrweb/ICPSR/studies/7736/version/2>

Link: Raw data available in ICPSR 8256 - County and City Data Book 1983 (DS1): <https://www.icpsr.umich.edu/icpsrweb/RCMD/studies/8256>

Link: Raw data available in University of Virginia - County and City Data Book (1994): http://ccdb.lib.virginia.edu/ccdb/ccdb/choose_states?type=county&year=1994

log_PerCapIncome: (log) County Per Capita Income

range:	[8.4677925,9.7809811]	units:	1.000e-07		
unique values:	126	missing .:	1/186		
mean:	9.19137				
std. dev:	.264367				
percentiles:	10%	25%	50%	75%	90%
	8.79103	9.03789	9.21989	9.40673	9.48433

Notes:

Source: Data generated from data series generated by the U.S. Census Bureau: “Table C3. Per Capita Income by County”. All per capita income values were reported in 1989 CPI-U adjusted dollars.

Details: Data sourced from columns labeled “Per Capita Income” and associated with the decade of the siting outcome (e.g., 1959 per capita income values were associated with outcomes occurring throughout the 1960s, while data from 1969 were associated with outcomes occurring throughout the 1970s, and so on). The raw values were log-transformed to account for non-normality in the distribution of values.

Link: Raw data available

at: <https://www.census.gov/hhes/www/income/data/historical/county/county3.html>

log_HSPct: (log) County Population with only High School Degree (%)

range:	[2.3418057,3.8628328]	units:	1.000e-07		
unique values:	102	missing .:	6/186		
mean:	3.45522				
std. dev:	.265969				
percentiles:	10%	25%	50%	75%	90%
	3.10455	3.31054	3.49347	3.65196	3.72569

Notes:

Source: Data generated from variables provided by the U.S. Department of Agriculture’s Economic Research Service.

Details: Data sourced from columns labeled “Percent of adults with a high school diploma only” and uses values from the decade of the siting outcome. Data were associated with the decade of the siting outcome (e.g., outcomes occurring in the 1970s were associated with values from 1970, while outcomes occurring in the 1980s were associated with values from 1980, etc.). The raw values were log-transformed to account for non-normality in the distribution of values.

Link: Raw data available

at: <http://www.ers.usda.gov/dataFiles/CountyLevelDatasets/Education.xls>

References

- Gomez, Brad T., Thomas G. Hansford, and George A. Krause. 2007. "The Republicans Should Pray for Rain: Weather, Turnout, and Voting in US Presidential Elections." *Journal of Politics* 69(3): 649–63. DOI: 10.1111/j.1468-2508.2007.00565.x.
- Heddleson, F.A. 1978. *Summary Data for U. S. Commercial Nuclear Power Plants in the United States*. Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Nuclear Safety Information Center: Oak Ridge, TN. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2172/5062376>
- Heddleson, F.A. 1973–1976. *Design Data and Safety Features of Commercial Nuclear Power Plants*. Volumes I–V. Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Nuclear Safety Information Center: Oak Ridge, TN.
- Klarner, Carl. 2003. "The Measurement of the Partisan Balance of State Government." *State Politics & Policy Quarterly* 3(3): 309–19. DOI: 10.1177/153244000300300305.
- Landis, Nomee. 2003. "Clear Choices Protect Black Water." *The Fayetteville Observer*. http://www.fayobserver.com/news/local/clear-choices-protect-black-water/article_7323f7c7-e3a2-5fe3-a94f-f0a4000238c5.html.
- McNerney, James, J. Doyne Farmer, and Jessika E. Trancik. 2011. "Historical Costs of Coal-Fired Electricity and Implications for the Future." *Energy Policy* 39(6): 3042–54. DOI: 10.1016/j.enpol.2011.01.037.
- Population Distribution Analyses for Nuclear Power Plant Siting*. 1983. Oak Ridge National Laboratory: Oak Ridge, TN. <http://web.ornl.gov/info/reports/1983/3445600490190.pdf>.
- Sondermayer, Roman V. 1974. "Thorium." In *Minerals Yearbook Metals, Minerals, and Fuels 1974*, Minerals Yearbook, ed. U.S. Bureau of Mines. U.S. Bureau of Mines, 1269–76. <http://digital.library.wisc.edu/1711.dl/EcoNatRes.MinYB1974v1>.
- United Engineers and Constructors Inc. 1984. *Energy Economic Data Base (EEDB) Program: Phase VI Update (1983) Report*. United Engineers and Constructors, Inc., Philadelphia, PA (USA). <http://www.osti.gov/scitech/biblio/6504693>
- U.S. Department of Energy. 1981. *U.S. Central Station Nuclear Electric Generating Units: Significant Milestones*. U.S. Department of Energy, Assistant Secretary Energy Technology, Office of Nuclear Energy Programs. DOI: 10.2172/6480768.
- U.S. Department of Energy, and U.S. Energy Information Administration. 1997. *Nuclear Power Generation and Fuel Cycle Report 1997*. Washington, DC: U.S. Energy Information Administration: Office of Coal, Nuclear, Electric and Alternate Fuels. http://inis.iaea.org/Search/search.aspx?orig_q=RN:29021863
- U.S. Energy Information Administration. 2015. "State Energy Data System (SEDS): 1960-2013 (Complete)." *U.S. Energy Information Administration*. <http://www.eia.gov/state/seds/seds-data-complete.cfm>.

Berndt/Aldrich US Nuclear Host Communities Replication Dataset Codebook

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission. Various Years (annual report). *Information Digest*. NUREG-1350. United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Division of Budget and Analysis. <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/doc-collections/nuregs/staff/sr1350/>